REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, and 16 have been amended, claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, and 20 have been canceled; as a result, claims 1–4, 7–10, 13, and 16-18 are pending, with claims 1, 7, and 16 being independent. Claims 1, 7, and 16 have been amended to substantially incorporate the limitations of claims 6, 12, and 20, respectively. No new matter has been added.

The Office Action dated July 30, 2008, rejected claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Garrido</u> in view of <u>Cranford</u>. Claims 5, 14, and 15 have been canceled, rendering the rejections of these claims moot, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn. Without addressing the merits of the rejections of claims 1 and 7, which are not conceded, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 7 have been amended to substantially incorporate the limitations of claims 6 and 12, respectfully, which were indicated to be allowable by the Office Action. Applicant thanks Examiner Bello for this indication of allowability, and respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1 and 7 be withdrawn. Applicant further requests that the rejections of claims 2, and 8 be withdrawn at least due to their dependence on allowable claims 1 and 7.

The Office Action rejected claims 3, 9, 11, 16, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garrido in view of Cranford, an further in view of Wagner. Claims 11 and 19 have been canceled, rendering the rejections of these claims moot, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 3 and 9 be withdrawn at least due to their dependence on allowable claims 1 and 7. Without addressing the merits of the rejection of claim 16, which are not conceded, Applicant further submits that claim 16 has been amended to substantially incorporate the limitations of claim 20, which was indicated to be allowable by the Office Action. Applicant thanks Examiner Bello for this indication of allowability, and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn. Applicant further requests that the rejections of claim 17 be withdrawn at least due to its dependence on claim 16.

The Office Action rejected claims 4, 10, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Garrido</u> in view of <u>Cranford</u> and <u>Wagner</u> and further in view of <u>Wu</u>. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn at least due to these claims' dependence on claims 1, 7, and 16.

Filing Date: February 9, 2004

Title: Continuous time filter-decision feedback equalizer architecture for optical channel equalization

The Office Action rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garrido in view of Cranford, and further in view of Kaneda. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn at least due to claim 13's dependence on allowable claim 7.

Dkt: BU3393/0033-095001

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests notification to that effect. The Examiner may telephone Applicant's attorney (208-286-1013) to facilitate prosecution of this application. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3521, referencing Attorney Docket No. 0033-095001.

Respectfully submitted,

Brake Hughes Bellermann LLP Phone 208-286-1013

Date October 30, 2008 By: Shane A. Kennedy/

Shane A. Kennedy Reg. No. 54,760